GRS IX-5]

Previous references. 1923-24 Mug

File No. 250-23

Serial Nos. 12-15

Later references

248-41-1-7.
232 (48-1-10)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 12 - 15

Part B for May 25

SUBJECT

Rebadaie to the drowni of the dispatch
Upaiin malt on the Bellary District.

To the Mug Cur. no. 1565 24-5-25
stating that all the virginias claimed
by the grain and recommended by the Mug Cur
may be granted except Sowkar Chetty,
Nagal dinniga and Venkatalakshmamma Palakka
Mudhiraja

G. R S. 11] 1923

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muz.)

NOTES.

File No. 250/1923

FILE HEADING.

Grant of a Rahadari to the Guru of Ujjini matt.

From

Hudigere Pattadhyaksha Siddalingo Swamy

No. Petition Dated 21-1-25 Received

Diary No.	Enclos 1	Spare Copies	Serial No
1225			

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays that in the case relative to the grant of honors to the said matt, the Muz Comr. may be asked to stop the examination of the witnesses the next day and postpone it etc.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

An endorsement was issued to the petr. in terms of the Member's note recorded on the petition.

By Mr N T Gopalaiengar, Adv for the petr Swamy, Instr No 1105 Dt 23

NOTES—First Sheet.

Serial No.

Informs him that his request is a most unusual one, and that Govt are not prepared to interfere in the proceedings going on before the Insp. Court.

By the Insp. Court.

D. memo no. 1106 of 23-7-25.

Forwards copy of the above.

Z

Mar Court's letter No. C. 964 of 28-24 & 1.2.25 submits a memo explaining the results of his enquiry in the case.

2 The memo gives the details of the enquiry held by the Insp. Court as regards the claim of the Hijra Swami now living in the Jagam State for the grant of a Rahadary.

Letter No. D-Dis 71 of 6.2.25 from the Tahsildar of Kundgol says that "It is stated that Sree Mahalinga Siddha Swami executed about 15 years ago a bond recognising Sree Siddalinga Swami as the head of the Matt & renouncing all his claims. All the properties both moveable & immoveable are now in possession of Sree Siddalinga Swami. The letter is praying assessment on land

× × × ×

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

So far as Govt. purpose of Inam

Serial No. 10

previous [illegible] of this file in which it has been represented that no papers regarding the grant of Rakadaya to the Balchennu matt are available in the Secretariat Records. The Secretariat compilation of 1888 referred to there has been sent in the Kundapura Vyasaraya swamy Matt Case.

a Bongh & F.N with modifications noted by the 1st member is on the file.

23/12/25

23 2 25

25

25. 2. 25.

Final note is put up for sanction & Decree

Final Note by the First Member of Council.

Subject:—

Grant of a Rahadari to the Swamigalu of Ujjani Mutt to tour in the State.

The Veerasaiva Mutt at Ujjani in the Kudligi Taluk of the Bellary District is one of the Panchachara Mutts of the Veerasaiva community and is reported to have a large following both in and outside the State. The Swamigalu (Sri Siddalinga Sivacharya Swamiga of this Mutt came to the State more than a year ago in connection with the ordainment of a Swami to the vacant seat of the Balehonnu Mutt. But as a Vatu for the Balehonnur peeta has not yet been selected the Swami of the Ujjani Mutt wants to tour in the State for Sishyarjane and he requests that a Rahadari may be granted to him. The application for Rahadari was first sent to the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur, by the Agent of the Mutt Mr. Siddappaiya on 13th February 1924. But some members of the Sadhulingayet community of Chickmagalur submitted a petition on 25th February 1924 to the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District protesting against the grant of a Rahadari to Siddalingaswami on the ground that the Swamy of the Ujjani Mutt had not visited Mysore for 30 or 40 years and that it is doubtful if the Mutt is entitled to the several Biradus claimed in the Agent's petition. This was also followed up by similar petitions from several Lingayets of Tumkur and other places submitting copies of proceedings of the meetings held in those places protesting against the grant of a Rahadari. The Deputy Commissioner thereupon issued notices to the contending parties to produce evidence in support of their contentions but neither party appeared before him in response. In the meanwhile, the Agent of the Ujjani Mutt having applied to the Muzrai Commissioner for the

grant of a Rahadari, the latter recommended in his letter dated the 24th March 1924 that a Rahadari might be granted. When the question was under consideration by Government Mr. N.T. Gopalienger, Advocate, submitted on 17th December 1924 a petition on behalf of Mr. Pattada Siddalingaswami, Agent of Sri Maralu Siddaraja Desikendra Swami, alleging that Maralu Siddaswami is the senior Swami and head of the Ujjani Mutt, that Siddalingaswami on whose behalf a Rahadari has been applied for is only a 'mari' or minor Swami of the Mutt who has strayed away from the Mutt and has been working against the interests of the Mutt contrary to the wishes of the senior Swamy an protesting against the grant of the Rahadari to Siddalingaswami. This petition as also several others to the same effect received from the Lingayets of the villages of Honnali, Haribar and other Taluks having been sent to the Muzrai Commissioner, he held an enquiry into the matter on 3rd February 1925 and subsequent days when neither was the Agent of Marula Siddaswami present nor was any evidence adduced by his counsel Mr. N.T. Gopalienger in support of his contention. Further, from a report obtained by the Muzrai Commissioner from the Tahasildar of Kudlige Taluk, it was seen that Marula Siddaswami executed some 15 years ago a bond recognizing Sri Siddalingaswami as the head of the Mutt and renouncing all his claims and that the latter is also the pattedar of the Mutt lands in the Taluk. The Muzrai Commissioner has, therefore, for reasons explained in paras. 14 and 15 of his note dated the 17th February 1925, recommended the grant of a Rahadari to Sri Siddalingaswamigalu. As the enquiry held by the Muzrai Commissioner goes to show beyond doubt that Sri Siddalingaswamigalu is a charanthi Swami of the Ujjani Mutt, I am of opinion that he is entitled to the honors due to the Mutt and that a Rahadari might be granted.

2. As regards the Biradus, the Swamigalu claims the following honours:-

1. Two pallakkis with Panchakalasa and Simha Lalata.
2. One Mena.
3. Two Chamaras.
4. Two valus.
5. Two white and red umbrellas.
6. Two Bhuchakradakodai
7. Two Aftagiri .
8. Two silver sticks
9. Two silver chota.
10. Makara Torana.
11. Bhalle Kattige.4
12. Two Kavi Nishani.
13. Nagara Deevatige
14. Nandi Dhwaja.
15. Kahale
16. Karne
17. Napuri
18. Nagari
19. Danka on horse back.
20. Bheri.
21. Chandra Vadya
22. Surya Vadya
23. 1 ~~camel~~ chariot.
24. Two elephants.
25. Four horses, cows, bullocks, guns, peons, Fouzdars &c.

3. Of these, according to the classification of insignias made in Government Order No. G. 11404-14/Pal.202-14-41 dated the 19th November 1919, Pallakki with Panchakalasa, Aftagiri and Makara Torana come under Royal Honours and Bhuchakradakodai, Kavi Nishani Chandra Vadya and Surya Vadya come under special honours, the rest being ordinary ones. Neither the sannads granted to this Mutt by His Highness Krishnaraja Wadiyar Bahadur III in 1823 nor the Rahadaris granted by the Residency in June 1814 make any mention of

these

these biradus. But the Agent of the Mutt has produced copies of the orders passed by the Huzur Adalat Court in the year 1860, whe some Brahmin residents of Tumkur having taken objection to the parading of certain honours by the Swami who visited the place matter went up to the Court. The Divisional Munsiff, Chitaldrug in his decision dated 9th April 1860 decreed that the Swamigalu entitled to (1) Pallakki with a single silver Kalasa, (2) Two red umbrellas, (3) Two Chamaras, (4) Danka on horse back, (5) Nandi Dhwaja, (6) Two silver sticks and disallowed Morchalu and Karedi Samelai. On appeal, the Huzur Adalat Court, in modification of the Munsiff's order decreed on 20th August 1861 that the Swami should not use chowry to the trunk of the elephant and that he was entitled to Hagal Deevatika (a royal honour), drum on horse back and a white and red umbrella (special honours). This decree was on appeal confirmed by the Judicial Commissioner on 21st March 1862.

4. The Muzrai Commissioner has in his letter No. C.964 of 1923-24 dated the 24th March 1924 recommended that as the prohibition conveyed in Government Order No. C.11,404-14/Pal.202-14-41 dated the 19th November 1919 for the use of Royal and Special honours without special sanction and without satisfactory evidence to claims thereto applies only to persons other than Mathadhipathis the Swamigalu may be permitted to parade all the insignias claimed by him excepting Panchakalasa with Simha-lalata, as Government have, in their order No. 5054-65/Muz.F.57 of 1902 dated the 18th May 1908 rejecting the claim of the Murgi Mutt for the above honors stated that this Biradu has nothing to do with the "five Acharyas"

5. I agree with the Muzrai Commissioner and solicit the gracious approval of His Highness to the issue of a Rahadari to Sri Siddalingaswamigalu of the Ujjani Mutt authorising the use of all the paraphernalias referred to in para.2 above with the exception of Panchakalasada Palakki with Simha-lalata.

FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL.

11/4/25

Submitted to His Highness.

I submit herewith for His Highness gracious approval the Final Note by the First Member of Council on the subject of the grant of a Rahadari to the Swamigalu of Ujjani Mutt to tour in the State.

Bangalore,
15th April 1925.

CSR.

JKV

STATEMENT OF CASES SUBMITTED FOR THE ORDERS OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA DURING THE TOUR OUTSIDE THE STATE IN.... APRIL 1925 .....

Serial No.	Subject	Recommendation of Council, or Member of Government in charge, as the case may be	Dewan's recommendation	Orders of His Highness	Orders regarding submission of file (vide foot-note)
574	Grant of a Rahadari to the Swamigalu of Ujjani Mutt to tour in the State.			Respectfully 27	Returned Letter No. 227

755 27-4 In reply 25

(82 Number)

Seen.

Please send me a note on the points raised in Home Dept. letter dated 4th inst. for my consideration

NOTE.—The letter a b or c may kindly be inserted by the Private Secretary to His Highness in the last column to indicate whether—

a. File may be submitted at once
b. File may be submitted after His Highness' return
c. File may not be submitted at all

3222—GPB—500—9-5-18

D.O. No: 22/
no one file

Brook Hill,
Naini Tal.
21st April 1925.

My dear Sir,

In returning herewith the Submission Note No.574 dated the 15th April 1925, re the grant of Rahadari to Sri Siddalinga Swamigalu of Ujjaini Mutt to tour in the State, I am directed to state that a Rahadari may be issued and that as regards the honours claimed it is doubtful whether he can be allowed to use white umbrellas and Hagalu Deevatige. His Highness will be glad if you will kindly further examine the admissibility of the birudus referred to above. Panchakalasada Pallakki with Simha Lalata cannot, of course, be permitted.

Yours sincerely,

Rajamantra Dhurina

A.R.Banerji, Esq., C.S.I., C.I.E.,
Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore.

and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19 . 13

Serial No.

The Augur dec's letter says,
"It is doubtful whether he can be
"allowed to use White umbrellas
"and Bagalu dirtiga. His Highness
"will be glad if you will kindly
"further Examine the admissibility
"of the brides referred to above."
In this connection, kind reference
is invited to the Judgment of
the "Adawlat Court which is
extracted here below for ready
reference: —

x x x

"In the reasons, the Augur
"decree is modified, and it is
"hereby decreed that the Respondent
"should not use a Chowry &
"Bunch of Cocks feathers and that
"he should not be included in
"use of a torch at day time, x
"x also a White Cover. x "
So the two brides referred
to in the Augur Secretary's letter
have been allowed by the
highest Court, and have been
in the Journals ever since.

This has been
done here

x 21

Serial No.

[illegible] in the
Civil Procedure Code
dated the 11th April 1925
vide page [illegible]

Under it only
Royal decree (day dress)
that is Royal Honor. The
other Unit Number 02 is a
Special Honor which may
be granted by Govt.

After the circulation
it is respectfully submitted that
the Drawing of this unfurnished
model (a Panchaloha Mark)
is according to the Instructions
of the Divisional Commissioner
in the case of the two Regimental
Sergeants, as particularly as
the Drawing of the Unit that the
Drawing of the Warrant Mark
which is not a Panchaloha
Mark is in the case of these
Warrants.

Draft letter to the Army
Secretary with the Regimental
Honorary Orders

NOTE—Contn Sheet

1365

File No. of 19

Serial No.	
4/1.5	It may not be necessary to address the new Central Thai Stage. For orders 1.5.25 182 member) the draft is approved may be issued 1/5 2/5. Issue 2.5.25

Serial No.	

RUPEES ٤٧-٢

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

Petition No. of 1924-25.

Hudigere Pattadhyaksha Siddalingaswamy.		Petitioner.
	--VS--	
Chara Pattadhyaksha Siddalingaraja - Desikendraswamy.		Opponent.

The petitioner's Advocate begs to state as follows:-

1. The petitioner applied to the Government of Mysore on behalf of Srimaddujjayani - Saddharma Simhasanadhiswara Sivanubhava Chara - Pattadhyaksha Marula Siddaraja Desikendraswami, Senior Swamy against any state honours being - granted to the opponent and was awaiting the - orders of the Government.

2. From a notice received by the petitioner's Advocate from the Muzrai Commissioner in C. No.964 of 23-24 he learnt that that office was holding an enquiry on the 19th instant. Accordingly the Advocate appeared before the Muzrai Commissioner that day. The opponent's Advocate - took time to file a written statement till the 26th instant.

3. The petitioner's Advocate received a notice this morning from the Muzrai Commissioner stating that he should attend his office to-morrow

and

.nd be present at the time o tamination of
)ne Sadasiva Sastry, Agent of the opponent who
,eems to be studying Sanskrit at Benares.

4. The petitioner learns that this per-
:on has been staying here for over a month and
half and wants to leave for Benares, which he
may do a week later.

5. The petitioner's Advocate who has pro-
:essional engagements at Mysore and Tumkur Dis-
,ricts on the 22nd to 24th instants represented
,o the Muzrai Commissioner orally and in writing
,is inconvenience and requested him to postpone
,he examination of Sadasiva Sastry till the 26th
.nstant when tne case is posted for the opponent's
efence.

6. The Muzrai Commissioner desired that -
,he petitioner's Advocate should entrust the -
:ase to some other lawyer and go. The petitioner
'eels that he cannot transfer his responsibility
o any other Advocate without the consent of his
:lient who is also absent from Bangalore. Notwith-
tanding the earnest entreaties of the petitioner
he Commissioner is bent upon recording Sadasiva
astry's statement to-morrow to the prejudice of
he petitioner. The petitioner's Advocate can
n no account over-look his previous engagement
,erely to satisfy the Muzrai Commissioner.

7. Unless the Government is pleased to
irect the Muzrai Commissioner to stop the examina
ion of the witness to-morrow and postpone it till
uch time as the petitioner may attend the peti-
ioner will suffer irreparably and his case will
be much prejudiced. The petitioner submits a

copy of his petition to the Muzrai Commissioner for perusal by the Government and prays for immediate orders being issued to that officer to examine the witness after the defence is stated by the opponent on the 26th instant and justice being done to his absent client. Meanwhile the petitioner's Advocate will take necessary steps to get his client on or before the 10th February next as he learns that he is ill at Madras.

BANGALORE
21-1-1925.

M. Gopalaswamy

Petitioner's Advocate,

Copy

Before The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore at Bangalore.

Petition No.C.964 of 1923-1924.

Sri Pattadhyaksha Siddalingaswamy. Petitioner.

--VS--

Sri Chara Pattadhyaksha Sri Siddalingaraja Desikendra Swamigalu. Opponent.

The petitioner's Advocate begs to state as follows:-

1. That a notice was served on him this morning that he should be present when the Agent of the opponent Swamy was going to be examined to-morrow i.e 22nd instant.

2. The petitioner has engagements previously fixed up for the 22nd, 23rd and 24th instants at - Mysore and Tumkur respectively which he cannot overlook.

3. The petitioner submits that the opponent has taken time till the 26th instant to file his - written statement and before he does so and before the petitioner knows exactly what the defence is - likely to be, he cannot know what to cross-examine the opponent's agent about.

4. Moreover, the petitioner is not in the - station and the Advocate cannot take the responsibility to cross-examine the agent without definite instructions from his client.

5. The witness is after all the opponent's agent and he should make it convenient to attend - this office at a future date to be fixed hereafter.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

Section Muz

File No. 230 – 23

Serial No. 13

No. 1105

Date of issue 23. 1. 25

Signed by Asst. T. K.

To

In reply to his application
dtd 21. 1. 25
regd no. 1225, presented
on behalf of Hudigere
Pattadhyaksha Siddalinga-
Swamy praying that
in the case relative
to the grant of
honors to the Swa
of Arjini math in
the Bellary Dist
the Muzrai Comm.

over.

Dft. sent herein. as
per members' orders
on the petition.

AN
23. 1. 25.

Above
23. 1. 25.

asked to stop the examination of the witnesses the next day, and postpone it till such time as the pleader may attend. Mr. W. P. Swaminathan, Bar., is informed that his request is a most unusual one and Govt. are not prepared to interfere in the proceedings going on before the Munsif in the manner asked for by him.

By order,

V 23/1/25.

Asst. Secretary

23/1/25

Copy to the Munsif Court is requested.

Asst. Secretary.

23/1/25

Asst. Secretary

List of enclosures

1106 & 23.1.25

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22

23/1/25

ONFIDENTIAL.

Encl 3 files

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore, Dated 16th February 1 9 2 5.

17

From

K. Chandy, Esq, B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

1 FEB 1925

D No 1365

Muz 250-23-14

To

K.V. Anantaraman, Esq, B.A.

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.938/M.F.250-23-8 dated 22nd December 1924 regarding the grant of a Rahadari to the Swamigalu of the Sri Ujjini Matha now at Tarikere, I have the honour to forward herewith a memo explaining the facts of the case and embodying the result of enquiry made by me in pursuance of the direction contained in your letter.

Ans Rev-

Urgent

18/2

18.2.25

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K Chandy

MUZRAI COMMISSIONER.

M.A.N.

M E M O

Subject:-- Grant of a Rahadari to Charapattadhyaksha Sri Siddlingaswamigalu of the Saddharma Simhasana Matha at Ujjini in the Bellary District.

---

1 On 13th March 1924 Mr.Siddaiya, agent of the above swamigalu, applied to the Muzrai Commissioner for the grant of a Rahadari in connection with the latter's tour in the State for Sishyarjane etc, and a recommendation was submitted in this office letter C.No.964 of 23-24 dated 24-3-1924.

2 On an objection petition presented to the Deputy Commissioner of the Kadur District by certain persons and on a report called for from the former, it was stated by the Deputy Commissioner that in view of the undertaking given by Mr.Santhappa Setty and Mr.Rudraradhya not to make the selection of a vatu to the Bale-honnur Matha without giving due notice to all the parties concerned, the objection petition lost its force.

3 A further report after hearing the Matha agent and the counter-petitioners who belonged to the sadhu Lingayet community having been called for, the Deputy Commissioner finally sent up his letter dated 24th October 1924. On a careful consideration of the claim of Sri Siddalingaswamigalu for the grant of a Rahadari, the original recommendation made by the Muzrai Commissioner was reiterated in letters dated 3rd November and 15th December 1924.

4 One Hudiggere Pattadhyaksha Siddalingaswami alleging to be the agent and Manager of Sri Marulu Sidda Swamigalu of the Ujjini Matha having presented a petition to Government through his counsel Mr.N.T.Gopala Iyengar protesting against the grant of a Rahadari to Sri Siddalingaswamigalu, it was directed in Revenue Secretary's letter No.938/M.F.250-33-8

dated 22nd December 1924 that necessary enquiry may be
and a report submitted to Government. In pursuance of the above d
the enquiry was fixed for 19th January 1925 and notices to the agents of
both the Swamies were issued- The registered letter sent to the agent
of Sri Siddalirga Swamigalu was taken delivery of and that sent to - -
Hoddigere Siddalingaswamigalu was received back in office on the 30th
January 1925 after having been redirected to about half a dozen - -
addresses. At the request of both sides, the hearing was adjourned to
Monday the 26th January. In the meanwhile Vyakarna Thirtha Vidyanidhi
Pandit Sadasiva Sastry, agent of the Sri Jangamvadi Matha at Benares,
being present at Bangalore on some business, the counsel for the opponent
prayed by means of a petition dated 20th January 1925 that his(Pandit's)
evidence might be recorded on or before the 22nd as the witness could not
stay till the 26th and as his statement would form very material evidence
to dispose of the petitioner's application. Intimation of this was given to
Mr.N.T.Gopala Iyengar and he was requested to be present on the 22-1-25,
when the statement of Pandit Sadasiva Sastry would be recorded-Mr.N.T
Gopala Iyengar presented petitions to Government and to the Muzrai Commissio
objecting to the enquiry and it is on the former petition that endorsement
No.1105 dated 23-1-25 was issued by Government- The statement, however, was
not recorded by the Muzrai Comm^r, but the counsel submitted an affidavit dated 22-1-25
sworn to before the City Magistrate of Bangalore. On the same day Mr.M.
Ramachendra Rao,Advocate, filed a written statement in answer to the
petition of Hoddigere Siddalingaswami, a copy of which was also given to
the counsel of the petitioner.

5 On 26th January 1925 Mr.Ramachendra Rao filed an additional"
written statement" and explained the case briefly on behalf of his client
Sri Siddalingaswamigalu.

6 Mr.Gopala Iyengar put in an application for an adjournment as he
was by himself unable to answer the several allegations contained in the
"written statements" and in the affidavit of Pandit Sadasiva Sastry.

7 After further discussion, it was agreed to by both the parties tha
the enquiry be resumed on 3rd February 1925.

On 29-1-25 Mr.Ramachendra Rao presented a petition requesting that

information about the possession of the Matha properties etc, might be obtained from the Tahsildar of the Kudligi Taluk, as such information would considerably help in correctly judging the merits of the case without further enquiry. The Tahsildar was written to in the matter, intimation thereof being given to Mr.N.T.Gopala Iyengar also.

9 On 3-2-25 parties were present as before and Mr. Ramachendra Rao produced certified copies of documents relied upon by him and Mr.Gopala Iyengar was given opportunity to examine them.

10 No reply having been received from the Tahsildar, the hearing was adjourned to Saturday the 7th February 1925 on which date arguments were heard and the case reserved for submission to Government for orders. The Tahsildar's reply was received on 10-2-25 and the same is submitted in original.

11 It is significant that though the enquiry was postponed from day to-day as above, the petitioner Hoddigere Siddalinga-Swami was conspicuous by his absence and that Mr.Gopala Iyenga not only did not exhibit a scrap of paper but also failed to adduce any oral evidence.

12 It seemed to the undersigned from the commencement that the petitioner tried to confuse the issue and to postpone the enquiry indefinitely by putting forth all sorts of objections, rather than to help the Court for a speedy disposal of the case.

The objection statement filed on behalf of the opponent and the written arguments presented by respective counsels explain the facts of the case fully and in sufficient detail- The question for consideration and decision is not primarily as to who has got proprietary rights over the Ujjini Matha properties but it is intimately connected whether the opponent is not one of the recognized charanti Swamies of the Matha and

whether he is not entitled to tour with all insignias in his capacit such.

14 Admitting that the petitioner Sri Marulu Siddaswamigalu is one o the recognized heads of the institution, it does not follow that the other charanti Swamigalu has no independant status and full liberty of action. Their Lordships the Judges of the High Court of Madras have said in appeal No.39 of 1918 that it cannot be said that"there is any evidence to show that the Senior Charanti Swami has any higher status than the Junior charanti Swami although the latter would naturally according to custom show deference to the former as a matter of social etiquette". From this it clearly follows that at best the two charanti Swamies could hold co-ordinate rank and one cannot have any superior claim over the other for the simple reason that Sri Marulu Siddaswamigalu is the older of tne two.

15 The affidavit of Pandit Sadasiva Sastry and the reply received from the Tahsildar of tne Kudligi Taluk go to prove conclusively that Sri Siddalingaswamigalu is at present the recognized head of the Institu and that both by learning, piety and high character he is entitled to the honours befitting his position.

16 The appointment of a successor to the Bale-honnur Matha and the grant of a Rahadari to the Swamigalu of the Ujjini Matha are two different matters and need not be mixed up. Government never extended a invitation to Sri Siddalingaswamigalu to come to Mysore and instal a vat on the Gadi. He came on his own accord and having come he wants to tour for sishyarjane etc, which seems to be a legitimate aspiration on the part of the Swamigalu. The question as to who should induct the vatu to newly selected into asrama does not now arise for consideration, as no selection has yet been made and it will be some time before a settlement is arrived at.
in this matter, Any action taken by the Swamigalu without previous approval is liable to become ~~inpractice~~ injunctions.

17 From a petition received from the Residents of Tarikere where S Siddalinga Swamigalu is camping for the last 10 months- it will be seen that all the paraphernalia belonging to the matha are with him and that

he is put to great inconvenience on account of the non-issue of a Rahadari.

In these circumstances it is recommended that permission to grant a Rahadari in terms of the Muzrai Commissioner's letter dated 24-3-24 may be accorded, subject to the proviso that the Swamigalu should not induct any vottu to the Bale-Honnur Matha without obtaining the previous sanction of Government.

All the records bearing on the present claim are submitted for reference.

MUZRAI COMMISSIONER.

M.A.N.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

... .

... .

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Mis

File No. 250 — 23

Serial No.

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, *the* *192* .

No. 1585
Mg 250 - 23 - 25

Date of issue 4 5 - 25

To The Mug Dist

Signed by Jt. D. Mis — g

Sir

over.

I have the honour
[illegible] all the Indian
[illegible] of the Govt
elected & recommended by you
with the exception of Sunkalatada
Palaki Sita Vandakalaga,
Sweta chatri and Kalyala Linga.
As regards the two latter,
I am prepared to
furnish for examination the
[illegible] of the bridges
and submit
in the [illegible]
[illegible]

List of enclosures.

dc
1/5

1/5/25

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27 7 22